

Appln No. 09/575,192
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Response to Office action of June 16, 2004

9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Thank you for the telephone conversation of 12 August 2004 (your time), which I believe clarified a number of the remaining issues in this case.

Specification

In the specification as filed, the Brief Description of the Drawings included erroneous information. The specification has therefore been amended to delete the erroneous information. We submit that no new figures or new material is added to the specification. The amendments are introduced in order to correct typographical errors. Furthermore, in relation to the figures we submit that none of the figures were omitted at the time of filing the specification, rather the Brief Description of Drawings included typographical errors when describing the figures.

We respectfully submit that Fig. 48 and Fig. 49 were erroneously referred to in the Brief Description of the Drawings. Consequently we have now amended the specification in a manner such that Fig. 48 and Fig. 49 are no longer referred to in the Brief Description of Drawings on page 8 of the specification.

We respectfully submit that this amendment does not introduce new matter into the specification.

Claims

To begin with, I have deleted claims 29 to 154, without prejudice.

Regarding the remaining claims, we discussed a number of amendments that we agreed help clarify the features of the invention. I understand that you will perform an additional search based on your understanding of the invention now claimed and provide me with feedback.

I will briefly put on record my explanation of the amendments. First, the claims now refer to a "plurality of reference points of the document", which clarifies that more than one reference point is inherent in the coded data.

Second, I have clarified that the indicating data is generated by the sensing device using at least some of the coded data.

Third, I have added that a description of "the at least one page" is retrieved in the computer system once the request has been identified from the indicating data. Whilst I think this was implicit in the earlier claim, I believe that clarifying this feature makes the claim a little more readable.

Finally, I have clarified that the document data sent for printing is based on the description of the at least one page.

Appln No. 09/575,192
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Response to Office action of June 16, 2004

10

As pointed out in earlier responses, I believe the critical distinction between this and the Lemelson citation is that Lemelson does not disclose using a printed document to generate a printed copy of at least one page of itself.

I believe these amendments add no new issues for you to consider, but rather clarify what was inherent in the earlier claims. If you believe any further issues remain in view of these amendments and our earlier conversation, I would be pleased to hear from you by email to arrange another telephone conversation so that we can finalise the matter.

Again, thank you for your efforts and assistance in this matter.

Further consideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762